arXiv:1605.00925v2 [hep-th] 23 Sep 2016

Supersymmetry Breaking as a new source for the Generalized Uncertainty Principle

Mir Faizal

Deptartment of Physics and Astronomy, University of Lethbridge, Lethbridge, AB T1K 3M4, Canada

Abstract

In this letter, we will demonstrate that the breaking of supersymmetry by a non-anticommutative deformation can be used to generate the generalized uncertainty principle. We will analyse the physical reasons for this observation, in the framework of string theory. We also discuss the relation between the generalized uncertainty principle and the Lee-Wick field theories.

As supersymmetry has not been observed, it is expected that the supersymmetry has to be broken as sufficiently large energy scales, and various mechanisms have been proposed for breaking of the supersymmetry at such scales [1]. A partial breaking of supersymmetry can also occur due to a non-anticommutative deformation of the original theory [2]-[6]. The non-anticommutative deformation of a theory has been motivated from the noncommutative deformation of ordinary field theories [7]-[10], where spacetime coordinates do not commute. As supersymmetric theories can be analysed in superspace (which contains additional coordinates with odd Grassman parity), it is possible to impose non-anticommutativity on these coordinates with odd Grassman parity. In this case, the ordinary products of fields is replaced by a non-anticommutativity Moyal product of fields. It is also possible to analyse a total breaking of supersymmetry by imposing a different kind of non-anticommtativity [11]. In this paper, we will demonstrate that this non-anticommutative deformation will generate the generalized uncertainty principle for theories where all the supersymmetry is broken.

It may be noted that the generalized uncertainty principle has been originally motivated by the existence of a minimum measurable length scale in nature [12]-[18]. The existence of such a minimum measurable length can be proven from the physics of black holes. This is because the energy required to probe a region of space below Planck scale is less than the energy required to form a mini black hole in that region of space [19]-[20]. So, any attempt to probe a phenomena below Planck scale will lead to the formation of a mini black hole in that region of space, and this will prevent any measurement in that region. Furthermore, almost all approaches to quantum gravity predict the existence of such a minimum measurable length in spacetime. The string theory is one of the most interesting approaches to quantum gravity, and strings are smallest probe in perturbative string theory. So, it is not possible to probe spacetime

below string length scale. Hence, string length acts as a minimum measurable length in string theory [21]. Even in loop quantum gravity, it is the existence of a minimum measurable length which turns the big bang into a big bounce [22]. However, the existence of such a minimum measurable length scale is not consistent with the usual Heisenberg uncertainty principle, and so the usual Heisenberg uncertainty principle has to be generalized to a generalized uncertainty principle to incorporate the existence of such a minimum measurable length [12]-[18]. The deformation of the Heisenberg uncertainty principle also leads to a deformation of the Heisenberg algebra, and this in turn deforms the coordinate representation of the momentum operator. A covariant formalism of the generalized uncertainty principle has been used to deform the equations of motion of quantum field theory, and the action for such deformed theories has also been studied [23]-[28]. In this paper, we will demonstrate that this deformation produced from the generalized uncertainty principle is exactly the same as the deformation which breaks all the supersymmetry of a supersymmetric field theory. Hence, the breaking of supersymmetry can be used as another motivation to study generalized uncertainty principle.

A four dimensional supersymmetric field theory with $\mathcal{N} = 1$ supersymmetry is parameterized as $(x^\mu, \theta^\alpha, \bar{\theta}^{\dot{\alpha}})$, where x^μ is a spacetime vectors, and θ^α, $\bar{\theta}^{\dot{\alpha}}$ are the two component Weyl spinors. A free Wess-Zumino model can be defined on this superspace as

$$S = \frac{1}{2}\int d^4x d^2\theta d^2\bar{\theta}[\Phi\bar{\Phi} + \bar{\Phi}\Phi]. \tag{1}$$

In terms of component fields, this action can be written as

$$S = \int d^4x[A\partial^\mu\partial_\mu\bar{A} + i\partial_\mu\psi\sigma^\mu\bar{\psi} + F\bar{F}]. \tag{2}$$

Thus, usual non-anticommutative deformation of the supersymmetric field theory occurs by deforming θ^α as $\left\{\theta^\alpha, \theta^\beta\right\} = C^{\alpha\beta}$, where $C^{\alpha\beta}$ is a two-dimensional matrix which causes the deformation of the theory [2]-[6]. Here $\bar{\theta}^{\dot{\alpha}}$ is not deformed. The supersymmetric field theory constructed on this superspace also gets deformed by this deformation of the superspace. In this deformed supersymmetric field theory all the product of fields are replaced by the Moyal star product of those fields. However, recently a different kind of deformation of non-anticommutative field theories has been constructed, and this deformation is defined as [11]

$$\left\{\theta^\alpha, \bar{\theta}^{\dot{\alpha}}\right\}_\star = \xi C^{\alpha\dot{\alpha}}. \tag{3}$$

Here $\xi C^{\alpha\dot{\alpha}}$ is again a two-dimensional matrix which causes this deformation, and ξ is related to scale at which supersymmetry will be broken. This deformation breaks all the supersymmetry of a four dimensional supersymmetric field theory with $\mathcal{N} = 1$ supersymmetry. It is useful to define $|C| = \frac{1}{2}C^{\alpha\dot{\alpha}}C^{\beta\dot{\beta}}\epsilon_{\alpha\beta}\epsilon_{\dot{\alpha}\dot{\beta}}$ as the determinant of $C^{\alpha\dot{\alpha}}$. It is also possible to define a Molyar star product

corresponding to this deformation as,

$$\begin{aligned} f\star g &= f\exp\left[\frac{\xi}{2}C^{\alpha\dot{\alpha}}\left(\overleftarrow{D}_{\alpha}\overrightarrow{\bar{D}}_{\dot{\alpha}}+\overleftarrow{\bar{D}}_{\dot{\alpha}}\overrightarrow{D}_{\alpha}\right)\right]g \\ &= fg+\frac{\xi}{2}(-1)^{s_f}\left[\left(D_{\alpha}f\right)\left(\bar{D}_{\dot{\alpha}}g\right)+\left(\bar{D}_{\dot{\alpha}}f\right)\left(D_{\alpha}g\right)\right] \\ &\quad -\frac{\xi^2}{16}|C|\left[\left(D^2f\right)\left(\bar{D}^2g\right)+\left(\bar{D}^2f\right)\left(D^2g\right)\right] \\ &\quad -\frac{\xi^2}{8}C^{\alpha\dot{\alpha}}C^{\beta\dot{\beta}}\Big[(\bar{D}_{\dot{\beta}}D_{\alpha}f)(\bar{D}_{\dot{\alpha}}D_{\beta}g) \\ &\qquad +(D_{\beta}\bar{D}_{\dot{\alpha}}f)(D_{\alpha}\bar{D}_{\dot{\beta}}g)\Big]. \end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

The deformation of the free Wess-Zumino model can be written as

$$S = \frac{1}{2}\int d^4xd^2\theta d^2\bar{\theta}[\Phi\star\bar{\Phi}+\bar{\Phi}\star\Phi]. \tag{5}$$

Now in the component form, the deformation of the free Wess-Zumino model can be expressed as [11]

$$\begin{aligned} S &= \int d^4x\left[A(1-\xi^2|C|\partial^{\nu}\partial_{\nu})\partial^{\mu}\partial_{\mu}\bar{A}+i\partial_{\mu}\psi\sigma^{\mu}(1-\xi^2|C|\partial^{\nu}\partial_{\nu})\bar{\psi}\right. \\ &\quad \left.+F(1-\xi^2|C|\partial^{\nu}\partial_{\nu})\bar{F}\right]. \end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

This is because $\Phi\star\bar{\Phi}=\Phi\bar{\Phi}+\frac{\xi}{2}C^{\alpha\dot{\alpha}}(D_{\alpha}\Phi)(\bar{D}_{\dot{\alpha}}\bar{\Phi})-\frac{\xi^2}{16}|C|(D^2\Phi)(\bar{D}^2\bar{\Phi})$, and $\bar{\Phi}\star\Phi=\bar{\Phi}\Phi+\frac{\xi}{2}C^{\alpha\dot{\alpha}}(\bar{D}_{\dot{\alpha}}\bar{\Phi})(D_{\alpha}\Phi)-\frac{\xi^2}{16}|C|(\bar{D}^2\bar{\Phi})(D^2\Phi)$.

We will demonstrate that the fermionic part of this deformed action will be exactly the same as the fermionic action deformed by the generalized uncertainty principle. We can write the fermionic part of this deformed action as

$$\begin{aligned} S &= i\partial_{\mu}\psi\sigma^{\mu}(1-\xi^2|C|\partial^{\nu}\partial_{\nu})\bar{\psi} \\ &= i\partial_{\mu}\psi\sigma^{\mu}(1-\beta\partial^{\nu}\partial_{\nu})\bar{\psi}, \end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

where we have define a new parameter β as

$$\beta=\xi^2|C| \tag{8}$$

The equation of motion for this fermion field is given by

$$i\gamma^{\mu}\partial_{\mu}(1-\beta\partial^{\nu}\partial_{\nu})\psi = 0. \tag{9}$$

It might be noted that this equation can also be produce by substituting

$$p_{\mu}=\tilde{p}_{\mu}(1+\beta\tilde{p}^{\nu}\tilde{p}_{\nu}) \tag{10}$$

in the following equation $\gamma^{\mu}p_{\mu}\psi=0$, where $\tilde{p}_{\mu}=-i\partial_{\mu}$. Thus, we can write the coordinate representation of this modified momentum operator as

$$p_{\mu} = -i\partial_{\mu}(1-\beta\partial^{\nu}\partial_{\nu}). \tag{11}$$

The coordinate representation of this modified operator is exactly equal deformation of the coordinate representation of the momentum operator is obtained by the following deformation of the Heisenberg algebra

$$[p^{\mu},x_{\nu}]=i\delta^{\mu}_{\nu}+i\beta(\delta^{\mu}_{\nu}p^{\tau}p_{\tau}+2p^{\mu}p_{\nu}). \tag{12}$$

This deformation of the Heisenberg algebra occurs due to a deformation of the usual uncertainty principle to a generalized uncertainty principle [24]-[28]. In fact, this algebra [24]-[28] is a covariant version of the usual deformed by the generalized uncertainty principle [12]-[18], and it corresponds to the existence of both a minimum measurable length and a minimum measurable time. This is because the generalized uncertainty corresponding to this deformed algebra is [24]

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta x^{\mu}\Delta p_{\mu} &\geq \frac{1}{2}\left(1+\beta\Delta p^{\rho}\Delta p_{\rho}+\beta\langle p^{\rho}\rangle\langle p_{\rho}\rangle\right)+i\left(\beta\Delta p^{\mu}\Delta p_{\mu}+\beta\langle p^{\mu}\rangle\langle p_{\mu}\rangle\right)\\ &= \frac{1}{2}\left(1+3\beta\Delta p^{\mu}\Delta p_{\mu}+3\beta\langle p^{\rho}\rangle\langle p_{\rho}\rangle\right). \end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

This in turn can be used to argue for the existence of a minimum measurable length l_s and a minimum measurable time t_s, in the theory, where

$$\begin{aligned} l_s &= \sqrt{3\beta} &= \sqrt{3\xi^2|C|},\\ t_s &= \sqrt{3\beta} &= \sqrt{3\xi^2|C|}. \end{aligned} \tag{14}$$

It is possible that for non-relativistic systems, the the temporal part of such a deformation might be neglected [29], and in this case, we can write [12]-[18]

$$[p^i, x_j] = i\delta^i_j + i\beta(\delta^i_j p^k p_k + 2p^i p_j) \tag{15}$$

The coordinate representation of the momentum operator can now be written as

$$p_i = -i(1-\beta\partial^k\partial_k)\partial_i \tag{16}$$

The generalized uncertainty principle corresponding to this deformed Heisenberg algebra, for the simple one dimensional case, can be written as

$$\Delta x\Delta \geq \frac{1}{2}(1+\beta(\Delta p)^2). \tag{17}$$

Thus, we can argue that the generalized uncertainty principle occurs because of the breaking of supersymmetry.

It may be noted that the relation between the non-anticommutativity and generalized uncertainty principle is something that was expected to occur. This is because the non-anticommutativity occurs due to background fluxes in string theory as a α' level effect as $C^{\alpha\beta} = \alpha' F^{\alpha\beta}$, and similarly $C^{\alpha\dot{\alpha}} = \alpha' F^{\alpha\dot{\alpha}}$. Furthermore, as string have an extended structure, and they are also the smallest probes that can be used in string theory, it is not possible to probe below the string length scale. Thus, the string length $\sqrt{4\pi\alpha'}$ will act as the minimum measurable length scale, deforming the Heisenberg algebra to $[x^{\mu}, p_{\nu}] = i\delta^{\mu}_{\nu} + if(4\pi\alpha')\left[\delta^{\mu}_{\nu}p^{\tau}p_{\tau} + 2p^{\mu}p_{\nu}\right]$, where $f(\alpha') \to 0$, if strings are considered a point i.e., $\alpha' \to 0$ [30]. This will deform the coordinate representation of the momentum operator as $\partial_{\mu} \to (1-f(4\pi\alpha')\partial^{\tau}\partial_{\tau})\partial_{\mu}$. Now the leading order behavior of $f(4\pi\alpha')$ is $f(\alpha') \sim \alpha'$ and the leading order behavior of β is $\beta = \xi^2|C| \sim \alpha'$ as $C^{\alpha\dot{\alpha}} = \alpha' F^{\alpha\dot{\alpha}}$. Thus, both the deformation are of α' order, and this seems to be the reason that the non-anticommutativity can be related to the generalized uncertainty principle. However, we have explicitly demonstrated that the

non-anticommutative deformation of the free Wess-Zumino model produces exactly the same results as the results obtained from the generalized uncertainty principle. Hence, it can be used as a new motivation to study the generalized uncertainty principle.

It may be noted that the non-anticommutativity will produce higher derivative terms, and so it will be problematic to view it as a fundamental theory. However, we view it as an effective field theory description of some more fundamental theory, where scales greater than a certain scale have been integrated out. We would like to point out that even though higher derivative terms have several problems associated with them, they are still being studied as they occur in various different approaches to quantum gravity. In this paper, we do not claim to resolve these problems associated with these higher derivative terms, but only demonstrate that the form of the higher derivative terms that occurs due to the deformation of a field theory by non-anticommutativity is exactly the same as the higher derivative terms produced by the generalized uncertainty principle. We would also like to point out that the the generalized uncertainty principle occurs in almost all theories of quantum gravity. So, non-anticommutativity should not be taken as the main reason for the occurrence of generalized uncertainty principle. It should rather be taken as another motivation for the occurrence of generalized uncertainty principle.

Finally, we will like to comment that the field theory obtained from non-anticommutative deformation [11], and generalized uncertainty principle [24], resembles a Lee-Wick field theory [31]-[32]. The Lee-Wick extension of the standard model has also been constructed [33]. It was observed that this Lee-Wick extension of the standard model stabilizes the Higgs mass against quadratically divergent radiative corrections. It has been demonstrated that the in the Lee-Wick extension of the standard model, the familiar see-saw mechanism for generating neutrino masses preserves the solution to the hierarchy puzzle provided by the higher derivative terms [34]. The flavor changing neutral currents have also been studied in the Lee-Wick extension of the standard model [35]. As the generalized uncertainty principle can be used to obtain a Lee-Wick extension of the fermionic fields, it would be interesting to investigate the consiquences of this relation between this Lee-Wick extension model and the generalized uncertainty principle.

Acknowledgments

We would like to thank Saurya Das for useful discussions.

References

[1] S. J. Gates Jr , M. T. Grisaru, M. Rocek and W. Siegel, Front. Phys. 58, 1 (1983)

[2] N. Berkovits, N. Seiberg, JHEP 0307, 010 (2003)

[3] A. Borowiec, J. Lukierski, M. Mozrzymas, V. N. Tolstoy, JHEP 1206, 154 (2012)

[4] O. Lunin, Soo-Jong Rey, JHEP 0309, 045 (2003)

[5] A. F. Ferrari, M. Gomes, J. R. Nascimento, A. Y. Petrov and A. J. da Silva, Phys. Rev.D 74, 125016 (2006)

[6] M. Faizal, D. J. Smith, Phys. Rev. D87, 025019 (2013)

[7] N. Seiberg and E. Witten, JHEP 09, 032 (1999)

[8] J. W. Moffat, Phys. Lett. B491, 345 (2000)

[9] E. Witten, Nucl. Phys. B460 , 335 (1996)

[10] A. Astashkevich, N. Nekrasov and A. Schwarz, Commun. Math. Phys. 211, 167 (2000)

[11] M. Dias, A. F. Ferrari, C. A. Palechor, C. R. Senise Jr, J. Phys. A 48, 275403 (2015)

[12] L. J. Garay, Int. J. Mod. Phys. A 10, 145 (1995)

[13] S. Das, and E. C. Vagenas, Phys. Rev. Lett. 101, 221301 (2008)

[14] M. Liu, Y. Gui and H. Liu, Phys. Rev. D78, 124003 (2008)

[15] L. N. Chang, Z. Lewis, D. Minic and T. Takeuchi, Adv. High Energy Phys. 2011, 493514 (2011)

[16] R. Easther, B. R. Greene, W. H. Kinney and G. Shiu, Phys. Rev. D 67, 063508 (2003)

[17] A. F. Ali, S. Das and E. C. Vagenas, Phys. Rev. D 84 , 044013 (2011)

[18] M. Maggiore, Phys. Lett. B 304, 65 (1993)

[19] M. Maggiore, Phys. Lett. B304, 65 (1993)

[20] M. I. Park, Phys. Lett. B659, 698 (2008)

[21] D. Amati, M. Ciafaloni and G. Veneziano, Phys. Lett. B 216, 41 (1989)

[22] P. Dzierzak, J. Jezierski, P. Malkiewicz, and W. Piechocki, Acta Phys. Polon. B41, 717 (2010)

[23] V. Husain, D. Kothawala and S. S. Seahra, Phys. Rev. D 87, 025014 (2013)

[24] M. Kober, Phys. Rev. D 82, 085017 (2010)

[25] M. Kober, Int. J. Mod. Phys. A 26, 4251 (2011)

[26] M. Faizal and B. Majumder, Annals Phys. 357, 49 (2015)

[27] M. Faizal, Int. J. Geom. Meth. Mod. Phys. 12, 1550022 (2015)

[28] M. Faizal and S. I. Kruglov, Int. J. Mod. Phys. D 25, 1650013 (2016)

[29] M. Faizal, M. M. Khalil and S. Das, Eur. Phys. J. C 76, 30 (2016)

[30] M. Faizal, A. F. Ali and A. Nassar, Int. J. Mod. Phys. A 30, 1550183 (2015)

[31] T. D. Lee and G. C. Wick, Nucl. Phys. B 9, (1969)

[32] T. D. Lee and G. C. Wick, Phys. Rev. D 2, 1033 (1970)

[33] B. Grinstein, D. O'Connell and M. B. Wise, Phys. Rev. D 77, 025012 (2008)

[34] J. R. Espinosa, B. Grinstein, D. O'Connell and M. B. Wise, Phys. Rev. D 77, 085002 (2008)

[35] T. R. Dulaney and M. B. Wise, Phys. Lett. B 658, 230 (2008)